

REMARKS

By this Amendment, Applicant amends claim 1 and cancel claims 2-14, without any prejudice or disclaimer to the subject matter thereof. Applicant also adds new claims 15-17 to address other aspects of the present invention. Claims 1 and 15-17 are currently pending.

In the Office Action, the Examiner objected to the title of the specification as being not descriptive; rejected claims 1, 2, 5, 8, 9, and 12 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0110073 to Shu et al. ("Shu"); rejected claims 3, 6, 7, 10, 13, and 14 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shu in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0172209 to Liu et al. ("Liu"); and rejected claims 4 and 11 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shu in view of Japanese Patent Publication No. 2002-007003 to Oya ("Oya").¹ Applicant respectfully traverses the Examiner's rejections under § 102 and § 103.

Regarding the objection

Applicant respectfully traverses the Examiner's objection to the title of the specification as being not descriptive. However, to expedite the prosecution of this application, Applicant has amended the title of the specification. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the objection to the title of the specification.

¹ The Office Action contains a number of statements reflecting characterizations of the related art and the claims. Regardless of whether any such statement is identified herein, Applicant declines to automatically subscribe to any statement or characterization in the Office Action.

Regarding claim rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Applicant respectfully traverses the Examiner's rejection of claims 1, 2, 5, 8, 9, and 12 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Shu. In order to anticipate Applicants' claimed invention under 35 U.S.C. § 102, each and every element of the claim in issue must be found, either expressly described or under principles of inherency, in a single prior art reference. Further, "[t]he identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in the . . . claim." See M.P.E.P. § 2131, quoting Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co., 868 F.2d 1126, 1236, 9 U.S.P.Q.2d 1913, 1920 (Fed. Cir. 1989).

Independent claim 1, as amended, recites a combination including, for example, "a controller configured to enable a PCMCIA standard when the playback section accesses the recording medium in the storage section, and to enable an ATA standard when an external apparatus accesses the recording medium, the ATA standard using ATA standard signals obtained by converting USB standard signals supplied from the external apparatus." Shu fails to disclose at least the claimed "controller" as recited by amended claim 1.

Shu discloses a DVD player 1 with a card reader 3 and an adapting interface 2. "The adapting interface 2 is a CF card with built-in controller or a PCMCIA card with built-in controller. The adapting interface 2 firstly converts the data read from optical disks or memory cards to ATA format and supplies the converted data to the DVD player 1." Shu, para. [0014]. Therefore, if anything, Shu teaches that DVD player 1 receives data in a single format, i.e., the ATA format. Shu does not disclose supplying signals having other formats to DVD player 1 even when a PCMCIA card is present in

card reader 3. Therefore, Shu fails to teach constitute “a controller configured to enable a PCMCIA standard when the playback section accesses the recording medium in the storage section,” as recited in claim 1 (emphasis added).

Further, as shown in Fig. 1, only DVD player 1 accesses card reader 3. Shu does not disclose any other apparatuses accessing card reader 3, and thus, fails to teach “an external apparatus accesses the recording medium,” as recited in amended claim 1. As such, Shu fails to teach the claimed “to enable an ATA standard when an external apparatus accesses the recording medium, the ATA standard using ATA standard signals obtained by converting USB standard signals supplied from the external apparatus,” as recited in claim 1.

Therefore, Shu fails to disclose each and every element of amended claim 1. Shu thus fails to anticipate claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. § 102. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the Section 102 rejection of claim 1. Because claims 2, 5, 8, 9, and 12 have been canceled, the Section 102 rejection of claims 2, 5, 8, 9, and 12 is moot.

Regarding claim rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Applicant respectfully traverses the Examiner’s rejection of claims 3, 6, 7, 10, 13, and 14 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shu in view of Liu and the Examiner’s rejection of claims 4 and 11 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shu in view of Oya. However, because claims 3, 4, 6, 7, 10, 11, 13, and 14 have been canceled, the Section 103 rejections of these claims are moot.

In so far as the Examiner’s rejections under § 103 are applicable to amended claim 1, Applicant submits that Liu and Oya also at least fail to teach or suggest the

claimed “controller configured to enable a PCMCIA standard when the playback section accesses the recording medium in the storage section, and to enable an ATA standard when an external apparatus accesses the recording medium, the ATA standard using ATA standard signals obtained by converting USB standard signals supplied from the external apparatus,” as recited in claim 1. Therefore, Liu and Oya fail to cure all the above noted deficiencies of Shu. Claim 1 is thus also allowable over Liu and Oya.

Regarding newly added claims

Applicant has added claims 15-17 to address other aspects of the present invention. Support for claims 15-17 may be found at, for example, FIGs. 1 and 3, and pages 14-16 of the specification.

Claim 15, while of different scope, recites similar language to that of claim 1, for example, “a controller configured to enable PCMCIA standard by turning off the first switch and turning on the second switch when the playback section accesses the recording medium in the storage section, and to enable ATA standard when the external apparatus accesses the recording medium.” Claim 15 is therefore also allowable for at least the same reasons stated above with respect to claim 1.

Moreover, Applicant submits that the applied references fail to teach, among other things, “a first switch configured to receive the ATA standard signals from the USB-ATA bridge and supply the received ATA standard signals to the storage section,” or “a second switch located between the playback section and the storage section,” as recited in claim 15.

For example, Liu teaches that “arbitration switch (16) will switch the IDE control signals (68) to the DSP (10) to process/decode the video/audio data and . . . switch the

USB/1394 control signals (66) to the microprocessor (50)." Liu, para. [0015]. Further, Liu's arbitration switch 16 only selects one of DSP 10 and microprocessor 50 to receive data from a memory card based on the type of the memory card. Liu, para. [0015]. However, Liu is silent as to switch 16 receiving ATA standard signals from an USB-ATA bridge. Therefore, Liu fails to teach or suggest at least "a first switch configured to receive the ATA standard signals from the USB-ATA bridge and supply the received ATA standard signals to the storage section," as recited in claim 15 (emphasis added).

Further, independent claims 16 and 17, while of different scope, recite similar language to that of claims 1 and 15, respectively. Claims 16 and 17 are therefore also allowable over the prior art of record.

Conclusion


In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and reexamination of this application and the timely allowance of the pending claims.

Please grant any extensions of time required to enter this response and charge any additional required fees to our deposit account 06-0916.

Respectfully submitted,

FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW,
GARRETT & DUNNER, L.L.P.

Dated: May 12, 2006

By: 
Wenye Tan
Reg. No. 55,662